DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 182 CG 014 634

AUTHOR Grossnickle, William F.: And Others
TITLE Psychological Variables Related to Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 11p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association (26th, Washington, DC, March 26-29, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes: *Collective Bargaining: *College Faculty: Higher Education: Individual Differences: *Job Satisfaction: Perception: *Predictor Variables: Salaries: *Sex Differences

ABSTRACT

Most research on faculty collective bargaining has focused on its extent and demographic variables such as age, salary, academic discipline, and rank. Little has been done to investigate individual differences which correlate with attitudes toward collective bargaining. The external validity of an earlier study done by Bigoness on correlates of faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining (ACB) was investigated using data obtained from 225 faculty members and administrators at a southeastern state university. The dependent variable was the ACB scale used by Bigoness. Independent variables included two measures of job satisfaction developed by Quinn and Staines, Levenson's IPC scale, and demographic variables of academic rank, salary, time employed by the university, and age. From the simple correlations for both men and women and men alone, five of the six best predictors of ACB were attitudinal/perceptual, with salary being the exception. For females, none of the variables correlated significantly with ACB. For both the total sample and for men alone, the three statistically significant predictors were, in order, a measure of job satisfaction, a perceptual measure (Internal Orientation), and one demographic variable (salary). (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED192182

PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES RELATED TO FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

William F. Grossnickle, Rosina C. Lao, and

Timothy D. Apple

East Carolina University

Paper presented at the

Southeastern Psychological Association Convention

Washington, D.C.

March, 1980

CG 014634

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William Grossnickle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES RELATED TO

FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

In recent years interest in faculty collective bargaining has increased. Much of the prior research has focused on its extent and demographic variables such as age, salary, academic discipline, and rank. Bigoness (1978) summarized much of this research and noted that little had been done to investigate individual differences which might correlate with attitudes toward collective bargaining. The purpose of this study was to obtain data bearing on the external validity of research done by Bigoness on the correlates of faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining (ACB).

Bigoness obtained survey data from 222 faculty members at a New England land-grant university (a 41% response rate). His dependent variable was ACB measured with a 7-item Likert-type scale (Feuille & Blandin, 1974). His independent variables were the Job Description Inventory (JDI), a job-involvement scale (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965), Rotter's (1966) IE scale, salary and age. Other demographic variables included sex, college, and academic rank, but these were not included in the reported analyses. He found an inverse relationship between ACB and salary, four of the five subscales of the JDI, internal orientation and age. From stepwise regression analyses he concluded that salary and the JDI subscales of work, pay, and promotional opportunities were statistically significant and that the addition of locus of control, job involvement, age, and the two remaining JDI subscales did not significantly increase the explained variance.

The present study is an attempt to demonstrate external validity for the work of Bigoness by using subjects in another state with a different law about collective bargaining. We also feel that the importance of psychological variables may have been dampened in Bigoness' study because of inappropriate measuring instruments, and we have tried to improve that in the present study. Based on prior research, our specific hypotheses are as follows:

1. Job satisfaction will be inversely related to attitudes toward collective bargaining.
2. Persons perceiving that external forces control their lives (either Powerful Others or Chance Events) will have more favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining than will persons perceiving that they control their lives (Internal).
3. Salary level will be inversely related to attitudes toward collective bargaining.
4. Older persons will have less favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining.

METHOD

Procedure The research was conducted at a state university in the Southeast with an enrollment of 12,000. In contrast to the New England university, state law does not permit collective bargaining with state employees. A questionnaire and cover letter stating that the questionnaire was for research purposes only were sent to all full-time faculty and administrators (who, by university definition, include departmental chairpersons). Eight hundred seventy questionnaires were sent by campus mail, 270 questionnaires were returned yielding a 32% response rate. Of these, 68 had omitted one or more responses. Using a criterion of no more than two omissions from the Facet-specific scale and no more than one omission from other areas, 23 additional questionnaires were considered useful. Mean values for the missing items were substituted. The total number of useable questionnaires was 225 (26%).

Subjects The respondents came from all 11 schools and colleges of the university. The mean age for males was 43 years, for females 41 years, and the university overall average is 41 years. For full-time instructional personnel, the mean salary for males was $21,900, for females $16,600; the university-wide salaries were $19,800 and $17,100, respectively. Table 1 shows university and sample comparisons by rank. Taking chairman and other administrators into account it seems, therefore, that the sample on which analyses were made is representative of the university as a whole.

Instruments The 21-item Short Form of the Overall Job Satisfaction Scale (Quinn & Staines, 1979) was used instead of the JDI for comparison with national trends. Eighteen items are called Facet-specific and comprise the subscales of Comfort, Challenge, Financial Rewards, Relations with Coworkers, Resource Adequacy, and Promotions. The remaining three items are overall measures of satisfaction and are called Facet-free. For preliminary analyses only the total Facet-specific and Facet-free scores were used. Quinn and Staines report that the internal consistency of the two measures are .85 and .56, respectively.

The second instrument used was the IPC Scale (Levenson, 1974). This was considered to be a better measure of locus of control than Rotter's IE scale (Lao, 1978), as the IPC Scale distinguishes between Powerful Others (P), with whom one can learn to deal with in an adaptive fashion, and Chance (C), where the respondent perceives events being caused by chance forces beyond his/her control.

The dependent variable was the 7-item attitude toward collective bargaining scale (ACB) used by Bigoness (1978). The questionnaire we developed includes all the above mentioned instruments as well as information on demographic variables such as academic rank, salary, time employed by the university, age and sex. Other demographic variables collected, but not used in analyses, were school or college, tenure status, and experience with collective bargaining organizations.

RESULTS

The simple correlations of the independent variables with ACB, combined for males and females and separately by sex of respondent are shown in Table 2. For males and females combined, the data clearly support the first three hypotheses, but the fourth hypothesis is not supported. For males alone, the results are the same, with the first three hypotheses supported and the fourth rejected. For females alone, none of the hypotheses received support.

Stepwise regressions, combined and by each sex, were performed to determine the combined effects of the nine independent variables on attitudes toward collective

bargaining. These are shown in Table 3. Only those variables which significantly added to the multiple correlation were listed. For males and females combined, three variables yielded an R of .38; all nine variables increased R to .42 ($p < .001$). For males alone three variables yielded an R of .52; the remaining six variable increased R only .02 to .54 ($p < .001$). For females, none of the variables, singly or in combination, significantly correlated with ACB.

For the simple correlations for both men and women and men alone, five of the six best predictors of ACB were attitudinal/perceptual (salary being the exception). From the regression analyses for the combined sexes and for males, the two best predictors were a measure of job satisfaction and a perceptual measure (Internal Orientation). The relatively high correlations among the components of the IPC scale are probably why P and C did not add significantly to the regression analysis (see Table 4). The same reasoning follows from the high correlations among the two measures of job satisfaction: .67 for both the total sample and males and .63 for females.

Because of the marked differences in the correlations for males and females, the data were analyzed for sex differences. Table 5 shows the means, standard deviations, and significance levels of differences. As can be noted, although the dependent variable, ACB was not significantly different between males and females, the means of six of the nine independent variables were significantly different for males and females.

DISCUSSION

For males, from the simple correlations, five of the six significant correlations were attitudinal/perceptual. Only one of the four demographic variables, salary, was significantly related to ACB. Using stepwise regression the three statistically predictive variables were, in order, one attitudinal (Facet-free job satisfaction), one perceptual (Internal Orientation), and one demographic (salary). These results support Bigoness in generalizing the importance of job satisfaction,

but they also indicate the psychological variable of locus of control may be more important than he suggests. This may be, as Lao has suggested, because the IPC is more sensitive to the multidimensionality of locus of control than is the IE scale.

As noted above none of the variables predicted female attitudes toward collective bargaining. The two variables approaching significance were a measure of job satisfaction (Facet-specific) and academic rank. This lack of predictability may be, in part, due to restriction of range. Sixty-seven percent of the females were in the two lowest academic ranks (see Table 1) and 80% were concentrated in two of the lowest salary brackets (see Table 6). We have no ready explanation for the lack of relationship between ACB and the IPC scores for the females.

In summary we believe this study calls attention to the importance that psychological variables have in forming attitudes toward collective bargaining and that future studies should include psychological as well as demographic variables. Future research should also be alert to the range of differences between sexes (or lack of variability), especially on demographic variables. Finally, we should look for some non-traditional variables, either psychological or demographic, to explain females' attitudes toward collective bargaining.

Table 1

Sample and University Comparisons by Rank

Rank	Males		Females	
	University-wide	Sample	University-wide	Sample
Administrators	*	7%	*	5
Full Professors	35%	18	16%	11
Associate Professors	31	27	21	17
Assistant Professors	19	34	42	53
Instructors, Lectures others	15	14	20	14
	100%	100%	100%	100%

*In the University's Institutional Research Report, administrators are listed under the appropriate academic rank.

Table 2

Correlation Coefficients with Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining

Variable	Total (N=225)	Males (N=146)	Females (N=79)
Facet-specific Job Satisfaction	-.32***	-.39***	-.21
Facet-free Job Satisfaction	-.25***	-.42***	+.05
Internal Orientation	-.25***	-.37***	-.04
Powerful Others	+.21**	+.27***	+.11
Chance	+.19**	+.21*	+.17
Salary	-.21**	-.23**	-.19
Academic Rank	-.15*	-.12	-.22
Length of Service	+.08	+.13	.00
Age	+.03	+.05	+.01

* $p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

Table 3

Multiple Regression Analysis of the Variables Correlated with Attitudes Toward Collection Bargaining

Total (N=225)			Males (N=146)			Females (N=79)		
Variable	R	R^2	Variable	R	R^2	Variable	R	R^2
Facet Specific	.32	.10	Facet-free	.43	.18	none significant		
Internal	.37	.14	Internal	50	.25			
Salary	.38	.15	Salary	.52	.27			
All variables	.42*	.18	All variables	.54*	.30			

* $p < .001$

Table 4

Intercorrelations Among the Components of the IPC Scale

	Total			Males			Females		
	I	P	C	I	P	C	I	P	C
I		-.38*	-.37*		-.32*	-.35*		-.49*	-.39*
P			+.61*			+.64*			+.51*

* $p < .001$

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance of Differences for Males and Females on All Variables

Variable	Males (N=146)		Females (N=79)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p
ACB	3.05	1.12	3.09	1.14	N.S.
Internal	35.31	6.51	33.43	6.18	.05
Powerful Others	18.89	8.06	30.33	7.62	N.S.
Chance Events	14.66	6.85	16.01	5.83	N.S.
Facet-specific	3.02	0.46	2.82	0.51	.01
Facet-free	3.95	1.15	3.45	1.22	.01
Salary	22568.	6617.	16867.	4484.	.001
Time (coded)	6.48	3.74	5.68	3.80	N.S.
Age	43.35	9.04	40.85	10.09	.05
Status (coded)	3.30	1.13	2.41	1.03	.001

Table 6

Male and Female Comparisons by Salary

Salary	Males	Females
$ 7,500	0%	4%
12,500	10	27
17,500	26	53
22,500	37	14
27,500	14	1
32,500	5	0
37,500	8	1
	100%	100%

REFERENCES

Bigoness, W. J. Correlates of faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 228-233.

Feuille, P., & Blandin, J. Faculty job satisfaction and bargaining statements: A Case Study. Academy of Management Journal, 1974, 17, 678-692.

Lao, R. C. Levenson's IPC (Internal-External Control) Scale: A Comparison of Chinese and American Students. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1978, 9, 113-124.

Levenson, H. Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of internal-external control. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1974, 38, 377-383.

Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M. The definition and measurement of job involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 24-33.

Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. The 1977 quality of employment survey. An Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1979.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1, Whole No. 609).